

# Canada-Japan Cooperation in Combating Global Terrorism

Naofumi Miyasaka  
Associate Professor, Department of International Relations  
National Defense Academy

## Introduction

In the world of antiterrorism, the United States is no doubt positioned as the utmost dominant power. American interests have been constantly a prime target of terrorism around the globe. U.S antiterrorism policy is so complex that not a single person, even a President or an excellent researcher, can grasp its whole picture. As the allies of the United States, it is only natural that Canada and Japan fight against terrorism in close cooperation with the United States. Regardless of the geopolitical positions, it is also obvious that Canada and Japan are not immune from the threats of various types of terrorism.

In combating terrorism, every nation is required to combine their efforts to comply with the so-called international standards such as the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373 adopted in September 28, 2001. In this connection, the idea of “comparative advantage” may be useful and effective. The concept is that each country provides its comparatively strong advantages for the containment of terrorism. Canada and Japan may have these advantages over the United States in some areas where the United States may face difficulties in performing her role. In this respect, it could be very meaningful for Canada and Japan to try to explore and identify these areas. This paper analyzes the possible roles of Canada and Japan in the arena of antiterrorism from the viewpoints of the nature of current terrorism and international cooperation.

## Global Terrorism: Three Types

Global terrorism is now one of the most pressing international security concerns. Every nation is encouraged to do whatever they can in order to contain, prevent, and crack down on terrorist activities. The meaning of global terrorism varies among terrorism analysts or government officials. In my typology, there are three types of global terrorism seen from the following organizational types;

**(1) Loosely affiliated structure;** Al Qaeda, affiliated with 11 groups imbued with common radical doctrine, is a typical example of this category which is fairly new. “Al Qaeda is not just an organization,” as a leading terrorism expert Brian M. Jenkins wrote in his monograph *Countering al Qaeda* (2002), “but it is a process”. The image of process is always ongoing, easily changeable, and hard to grasp. It operates on center-liaison-cells machinery but its membership, whereabouts and overall operation are not clear. Al Qaeda is not just a Middle Eastern terrorist organization but “the process” which has penetrated into such regions as Southeast Asia, Africa, Eurasia, and the Western Hemisphere. The top priority of the international society in combating terrorism at present is a war against Al Qaeda on global fronts.

**(2) Cooperation among the different kinds of terrorist organizations.** As this example, we can cite the relationship between Columbia’s largest and best-equipped FARC (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia) and IRA in Northern Ireland. Neither ideology nor objective is

shared between these two groups, and each group is domestic in nature; however, globalization and modern technology in communications are enabling them to work together. In future, this kind of secret communications will grow among terrorist and criminal organizations through the exchanges of weapons, money, information, technology, training, and even advisers and soldiers like mercenaries. The influence of these phenomena will surely go over the boundaries of the countries concerned.

**(3) Single-issue terrorism;** This type of terrorism also has a potential to grow to a global scale. The typical example is the single-issue terrorist organization in the field of animal rights, environment, anti-abortion etc. Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom have confronted with this kind of terrorism whereas Japan has not. Hate group such as Neo-Nazi may also be categorized into this type of terrorism. We can see these groups in several nations; they are basically independent from each other; neither allied nor networked. Most of these groups are very small and domestically contained. However, as some of their fanatic beliefs are popularly shared beyond national borders, these groups may be easily organized across countries and join hands in the plots against civilization.

The anti-globalization activities agitated by groups including right wing, left wing, and anarchists for their different motives, appear to be ad-hoc in nature which take place only when economic conferences of world attention are held, but it is likely that far more radical splinters may stem from their protest rallies.

Now, the war on terrorism has been ongoing against the first type, especially Al Qaeda, but at the same time, we should pay as much attention as possible to the second and the third types of global terrorism.

### **Terrorism in Japan**

Here, let me make a brief presentation regarding the terrorism situation in Japan. We are now confronted with religious, political, and international terrorism. However, the threat of global terrorism per se as mentioned above is not regarded as a serious one in Japanese perception.

Instead of that, Aum Shinrikyo is currently a nation's gravest concern. This doomsday cult and the world's first CBRN terrorist organization, is still active despite the arrests of many of the cadre and the constant surveillance by the Public Safety Investigation Agency. The current membership is estimated at 1,650. The group renamed itself to Alepf in 2000. Under the new leadership of Joyu Fumihiko, they criticized themselves for the numerous wrongdoings committed by the ex-leader Asahara Shoko and his cadre in the past; however, concerning religion they express their gratitude to Asahara and intimately call him "The Father of the Group". It may be probably because they have understood that it would be difficult to survive as an organization unless they show the proof to the public that the Aum has broken away from the past and transformed itself into a peaceful and harmless religious organization.

Since 1995, they have not committed serious crimes; however, they have caused troubles in some cities and raised concerns and protests among the local residents. It is important to remember that Aum-affiliated software companies had accepted purchase orders as sub-sub contracts from 140 corporations whose clients include the National Defense Agency, the National Police Agency, NTT groups etc. This was reported in 1999, which is an evidence that

the Aum has an ability to penetrate into the electronic system of government and civil society. As the world faces the threat of cyberterrorism, it is ominous that Aum claims to be a “Cyber Kyodan” or cyber religious organization in its own publicity.

In 2001, some Russian followers were indicted on the charge of attempted bombings in Tokyo and Aomori, a northern provincial city, as part of the plot to free Asahara from jail and smuggle him to Russia. It is well known that the Russian factor had been critical to Aum’s weapon pile-up until 1995. But since then, the activities of the Aum in Russia seem to have come to the public attention only fragmentarily.

Japanese authorities now face an option of whether the Group Regulation Act which expires in January next year will be extended and applied to the Aum. The Act has been a statutory key for keeping the Aum in check. Without it, government officials are not permitted to enter into their facilities around Japan for checking, and Aum is not required to submit the group’s member list and fund. In other words, the Act is the only tool to guarantee the transparency in order to reduce people’s anxiety.

There are other terrorist organizations such as political far-left and far-right wing groups in Japan. The far-left wings, such as Chukaku-ha, have frequently been attacking government officials or some public facilities with homemade bombs or mortars; and, at the same time, they have been assaulting each other. Only the Japanese Red Army was international in its scope of activities. It is reported that its small cells still existed in Japan as evidenced by the arrest of Shigenobu Fusako, a leader of Japanese Red Army, in Osaka in 2000.

Unlike left wing, right wing ideology is indigenous in Japan. In many aspects, right wing is not regarded as pure political movement; rather it resembles criminal organizations; these organizations, especially Yakuza, sometimes call themselves right wing. The means of their assault are far more offensive and dangerous to the society than left wing; their targets include lawmakers, press, government officials and business people. They usually do not use bombs; their usual tactics are physical attacks by small firearms or knives on specifically targeted persons.

When Japanese use the term terrorism or terrorists, they usually mean the terrorism or terrorists outside their homeland carried out by foreign terrorists against; the Japanese government does not designate right wing, left wing and Aum Shinrikyo as terrorist organizations. The network of international terrorism in Japan is relatively on low profile. Unlike in other democratic countries, the cells of Al Qaeda and other militant groups have not been detected so far; In addition to that, unlike the situation in Canada or the United States, there are no eco-terrorist, animal right or anti-abortion organizations or racial and anti-ethnic hate groups as I described above as a type of global terrorism. At least, we do not detect any sign that they are on the rise with a visible danger to our society. Since the international terrorism does not affect our life directly, the Japanese image of terrorism is dominated by the foreign topics such as 9/11. Except this, specific organization or type of terrorism does not come to their attention.

The Japanese society has nurtured the world’s most notorious groups such as the Japanese Red Army and Aum Shinrikyo. Nevertheless, the Japanese antiterrorism policy was relatively lax; from 1970 when Japan first experienced the hijacking incident, Japanese approach to terrorists was a “soft” one; that is, “always seek a peaceful solution policy” to avoid human losses; as a result, Japan got a bad reputation of easily surrendering to hijackers’ demands; as a matter of fact, we released prisoners and paid ransom through the 1970s.

Through the latter half of the 1990s, while the G8 and international society were unequivocally advocating antiterrorism policy in order to prevent and respond to such CBRN terrorists as Aum Shinrikyo, Japan had never proclaimed terrorism to be a national security issue. For many Japanese, terrorism is an emergency issue similar to natural disaster; we paid attention only to the hostage-incidents abroad. Once the crisis was over, the government forgot to do its best to chase, crack down on the terrorist organization with other countries and relevant international organizations.

After 9/11, the Japanese government took some antiterrorism measures; cooperate with other nations to improve the situation in Afghanistan, strengthen the guard and defense against terrorist attacks in the homeland soil, restructure the relevant departments to address terrorism effectively, and participate in terrorism conferences; at last, Japan began to act on it, but still lacks the most basic points; definitions of terrorism, designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and threat assessment.

Regarding the definitions, NPA and Public Safety Investigative Agency have it but neither is to punish terrorist activity. To define terrorism shows the nation's will to address the issue in daily operation. Designation of FTOs and TEL (Terrorist Exclusion List) as practiced in the United States is one of the most important tools to combat terrorists who move easily beyond national borders. Threat assessment should be done thoroughly against intended plots and capability of various kinds of terrorists because the assessment is a basis for deciding policy priority.

### **Japan-Canada Cooperation**

The US State Department reported in the *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001* that overall antiterrorism cooperation with Canada was excellent, and stands as a model of how the US and another nation can work together on terrorism issue. Actually there is a long history of law enforcement cooperation between these two countries. We can safely say that the bilateral relationship of Canada-Japan is not qualitatively same as the U.S.- Canada because of the geographical location. Although a terrorism incident involving only Japan and Canada did not happen and specific concerns are not shared between both nations, Canada and Japan can cooperate in various kinds of antiterrorism measures.

Canada and Japan are the members of G8 which has been the central forum for tackling international terrorism. Antiterrorism resolve was first declared at the G7 summit of 1978, when the discussions on terrorism at the Six Committee of the United Nations General Assembly had been dead-locked. After this declaration, the partners concerned repeatedly declared renouncement of terrorism and tried to show the leadership and resolve to defeat terrorism. It was epoch-making that the 1995 Ottawa Ministerial Conference was held in accordance with the G7 Halifax summit declaration in order to discuss cooperative antiterrorism measures just after the antiterrorism world entered into the new post-Aum Shinrikyo era. The Ottawa Declaration and its content were succeeded by the following year's Paris Ministerial Conference where the G8 reached an agreement to the specific 25 recommendations of cooperative antiterrorism measures. The 25 recommendations were the landmark and starting points for each nation to address the problem in the new terrorism era. More recently, it is worth noting that, in the aftermath of 9/11

and the following war in Afghanistan, G8 reviewed the 25 measures and expanded to 37 at the 2002 Whistler Meeting of Foreign Ministers.

Needless to say, Canada and Japan should make an effort to materialize each recommendation. The recommendations, however, are not all of what we can and should do. I propose as follows;

### **(1) Conference on Antiterrorism and Democracy**

First, we should work on to hold track-2 conferences on Antiterrorism and Democracy. In combating terrorism, the most important thing is that, while maintaining our freedom and democratic values in our society, nations strengthen intelligence and investigation capability. The G8 faces the difficulty of making the golden balance between these two. The conference will aim to learn experiences of how the antiterrorism tools such as laws, executive orders, and activities of intelligence/investigation community impact on civil society, and how to overcome the conflict between government and civil society. The relationship between press, human rights groups and government should be examined. It should be held as an open forum in order to help general people and other nations understand the problem of antiterrorism. Emotional response coupled with unnecessary fear will damage democratic values. If we do not sacrifice these values temporarily, we will be defeated by terrorism. If a country is too immersed in antiterrorism, like the United States after 9/11, it might be difficult for that country to sponsor the conference. Not only G8 members but also any developing countries that fight terrorism should be encouraged to participate in such conference.

### **(2) Promoting Strategic Talks**

Secondly, Canada and Japan, as the members of the APEC, may approach the Southeast Asian countries to institutionalize strategic talks with the Arab countries in order to take necessary steps for disrupting terrorism activities across two regions. It is well known Al Qaeda has been penetrating into the Asian region; authorities discovered linkage between Jemaah Islamiya (JI), Kumpulan Mujahidin Malaysia (KMM), Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG), MILF (Moro Islamic Liberation Front) and Al Qaeda. Geographically, the wide area from the Middle East to the Indian Ocean, and to the South China Sea is increasingly becoming a hotbed of terrorism. There are regional conventions, too: the Arab Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism of 1998, SAARC (South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation) Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism of 1987; ASEAN and APEC respectively agreed upon specific antiterrorism measures in the wake of 9/11. What is needed now is a new forum for the Southeastern Asia and Arab countries. Canada and Japan may encourage them to start talks as the first step on antiterrorism conventions of wider area.

### **(3) Antiterrorism Publicity**

In our antiterrorism community, no one can deny that the United States has been playing an essential outstanding role; without the American military, the Al Qaeda-Taliban regime in Afghanistan could have survived; without the American sense of crisis, G-8 could not have proposed a variety of recommendations. However, the United States has a weak point; anti-American feelings around the globe. Peter Peterson, a chairman of the Council of Foreign Relations wrote in his article "Public Diplomacy and the War on Terrorism" in *Foreign Affairs* as follows; "Today, America has a serious image problem...there is little doubt that stereotypes

of Americans as arrogant, self-indulgent, hypocritical, inattentive, and unwilling or unable to engage in cross-cultural dialogue are pervasive and deeply rooted...”

In considering any terrorism, to gain people’s hearts and minds to its maximum is an important factor. Whether terrorist organizations are encouraged to step up their radical course or they feel isolation depends on the audience’s support and feeling. It is often said that publicity is like oxygen for terrorists; hence, the terrorists utilize press and Internet to spray message and their cause to the audience of the world. The same thing can be said to antiterrorism strategy; public affairs and public diplomacy is essential to win the psychological aspects of war on terrorism. Without it, whatever governments pile up as antiterrorism measures will collapse from its very basis. For Canada and Japan, which can play a role in the arena where the United States cannot, it seems that now is the opportune time to provide alternative visions for the peoples in the terrorism-torn countries.

#### **(4) CBRN terrorism conference**

CBRN (Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear) terrorism is the most inevitable topic when we consider the threat of terrorism. Prevention and Consequence Management (CM) strategy should be built in and shared by the antiterrorism community. Canada and Japan have frequently held such conferences with the United States respectively. So, why not between Canada and Japan. CM is not a universally accepted concept but its importance as an emergency response is well understood. It is also important to focus on CBRN non-proliferation and dismantling that may directly affect the arsenal of terrorist organizations. Arms control arrangement should be re-constructed as a means of antiterrorism. The United States turned away from the Review conference on the Biological and Toxic Weapons Conventions and rejected CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty). While Canada and Japan should lend their fullest support to the United States in the field of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and its materials (and biological weapons will also become important in the future) in the former Soviet Union as agreed at the 2002 Kananaskis summit, both nations in place of the United States, should think about the new kind of arms control arrangement for antiterrorism in the form of CBRN terrorism conference.

#### **Conclusion**

Regardless of terrorism type, combating global terrorism has two goals; One is to crack down on individually identified terrorist organizations; and the other is to prevent and redress “terrorism structure” in general.

The methods of combating global terrorism must be comprehensive and extensive covering all such areas as diplomacy, law-enforcement, military, and intelligence. The new war on terrorism what I call the New Total War needs to be a multi-pronged, multi-agency and multi-dimensional response by the international community.

The cooperative actions toward these common goals should be jointly enforced and constantly reviewed at the follow-up discussions. But, given the fact that each nation has different circumstances and regulations, the “division of labor” is also an important factor among the G8 and APEC members among which Canada and Japan have ample role to play to reduce terrorism structure and contribute to combating terrorism.

**Disclaimer**

This paper was written from the author's personal point of view. It does not necessarily reflect the official views of the Japanese government, the organization I belong to, or any other relevant agencies.